

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 6-14, 16-20 and 22-29 are pending in the application, claims 26-29 being new.

**Indefiniteness of Claims 1, 16, 23 and 24**

In the Office Action, claims 1, 16, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner objected to the language "Caller ID information service". The Examiner's suggested language is adopted herein (with the exception of the use of the term 'subscription', as Caller ID service may or may not be provided by a paid subscription (e.g., it may be free).

Claims 1, 16, 23 and 24 apparently being more definite, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Claims 1, 3-14, 16-20 and 22-25 over Tatchell**

Claims 1, 3-14, 16-20 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,905,774 to Tatchell ("Tatchell"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 4 and 5 are canceled herein. Claims 1, 3, 6-14, 16-20 and 22-25 recite notification upon satisfaction of a predetermined event based on receipt of at least TWO telephone calls within a predetermined range of time, to notify a remote user with a notification message. This language incorporates language formerly recited in now-canceled claim 3.

With respect to claim 3, the Examiner cites col. 16, lines 41-51 of Tatchell for allegedly teaching that 'particular events include an occurrence of a predetermined number of telephone calls within a range of time from a particular caller'. This passage of Tatchell discloses that an incoming call log feature enables the subscriber to MANUALLY review a list of new calls and/or a list of the last, say, fifteen callers, as shown in Table 3.0.

Tatchell's Table 3.0, cited by the Examiner, is nothing but a SUMMARY of INCOMING calls. Moreover, the summary of incoming calls is MANUALLY reviewed by the user.

Tatchell fails to disclose satisfaction of a particular event ONLY upon receipt of AT LEAST TWO telephone calls, much less that those two telephone calls must be received WITHIN A PREDETERMINED RANGE OF TIME as recited in claims 1, 3, 6-14, 16-20 and 22-25.

For at least all the above reasons, claims 1, 3, 6-14, 16-20 and 22-25 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**New claims 26-29**

New claims 26-29 require notification of a notification message communicated via an Internet. New claim 27 requires that the notification message be an email.

Tatchell, cited by the Examiner with respect to other claims, fails to disclose, teach or suggest ANY communication over an Internet, much less use of an email message.

The Examiner has indicated that he interprets Fig. 1 of Tatchell as teaching the transmission over the Internet. (See Office Action, bottom of page 4). It is respectfully submitted that Fig. 1 very clearly shows a SWITCHING network. The Internet is a PACKET network. The two are ENTIRELY different.

Similarly, the Examiner has indicated that he ‘interprets’ VOICEMAIL as EMAIL.

Voicemail is NOT email.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman  
Reg. No. 36,457

**MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC**

2000 M Street, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036-3307  
TEL. (202) 261-1020  
FAX. (202) 887-0336